

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent application publication 2002/0080615 to Marshall et al. (herein "Marshall"). Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Marshall. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Marshall. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Marshall. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 2,041,315 to Barclay. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Barclay. Claims 3-6, 9-12, 14-17, and 19-22 were objected to as dependent upon rejected base claims, but were noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 3-6, 9-12, 14-17, and 19-22.

Addressing the above-noted rejections based on Marshall and Barclay, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over those applied arts.

Initially, applicants note each of the claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now clarifies a structure of the collection optics to recite that the collection optics has "a light output surface at a side of the light device". For example as shown in Figure 1 in the present specification the collection optics has a light output surface 8 at a side of the light device. The other independent claims are amended by the present response to now include similar features as noted above.

The claimed invention is directed to a light device shown as a non-limiting example in Figure 3 in the present specification. In the claimed light device a light source generates a

majority of light in a primary direction towards a front of the light device, to be output from a lens device, see for example primary light beams 11 in Figure 3. In the claimed invention collection optics are provided to capture a portion of the light generated from the light source, have a light output surface at a side of the light device, and output the captured light in a direction other than in the primary direction towards a side of the light device. In the embodiment shown in Figure 3 output side emitting light beams 14 are output towards a side of the light device from output surface 8.

With such a claimed structure, a light device can be provided in which light is output from both a front and side of the light device from a light emitting diode (LED) light source.

The above-noted features recited in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

Marshall is directed to LED collimation optics. As shown for example in Figure 1B in Marshall all light output from the light source 1 is output from a front face in collimated form.

In contrast to Marshall, in the claimed invention the collection optics include a light output surface at a side of the light device. That is, in the claimed invention the output surface of the collection optics is at a side of the light device, in contrast to the light output from the lens device towards the front of the light device. Such a feature clearly distinguishes over Marshall.

The basis for the outstanding rejection appears to cite Figure 1B in Marshall as disclosing light can be output towards a side of the device from the front of the device. However, applicants respectfully submit it is clear from Figure 1B in Marshall that there are no collection optics with the light output surface at a side of the light device. As noted above one feature in the claimed invention is to be able to allow light to be output from a front

direction through a lens device and also in a side direction through collection optics. Such features clearly distinguish over Marshall.

Further, with respect to the further cited reference to Barclay, Barclay clearly differs from the claims. Barclay does not disclose or suggest any structure in which a portion of the same light that is output from the front lens is also output at a side through collection optics. Instead, as shown for example in Figure 3, Barclay discloses a separate light source 14 to output light in the side direction. The present invention has a contrary operation as in the present invention a portion of the same light output from a light source that passes through a front lens is also captured to be output towards a side of the light device.

The outstanding rejection appears to cite element 16 in Barclay to meet the claim limitations. However, that element 16 is merely a side lens in Barclay. As clearly shown in Figure 3 in Barclay a separate light source 14 is provided to output light through the side light lens 16. Barclay does not disclose or suggest that the side light lens 16 can capture a portion light generated from the light source 11. Again in the claims the same light source that outputs light through a lens also has a portion of its output light captured by a collection optics, which captured light is then output to a side of the light device. Clearly Barclay does not disclose such features.


In such ways, the claims also clearly distinguish over the teaching in Barclay.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written clearly distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Charles L. Gholz
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 26,395

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\22's\228204\228204US-AM1.DOC